

REMARKS

Claims 31-49 and 51 were rejected in an Office Action dated May 18, 2007. Claims 31, 33, 35, 39, 41, 42, 44-47, 49, and 51 have been amended in the present response in order to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter.

Priority

Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's remarks regarding priority, and in order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants address the cited art.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. In the Office Action, the term “minimizes” in claim 49 was deemed a relative term that rendered the claim indefinite (Office Action, pg. 4, first paragraph). Applicants submit that the specification defines the term “minimizes” in the context of reducing “the ID verification that is required to be conducted by the agent at the check-in counter” (Specification at [0144]). In order to clarify this point, Applicants have amended claim 49 as shown above.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§102 & 103

Claims 31-35, 39-44, 47-49, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0024988 (“Stanard”).

Claims 31, 42, and 51 are the independent claims. By way of example and not limitation, newly amended claim 31 recites:

A system for expediting security checking, comprising:

an interface configured to receive orders for products, services and security clearances provided by a plurality of merchants and venues, said interface receiving an order for a security clearance from a device remote from said plurality of venues, wherein said security clearance applies to a venue selected from said plurality of venues by an individual, and *said security clearance is based on a calculation of the risk posed by said individual and a calculation of the risk posed by any groups associated with said individual*; and

a transaction module that routs said security clearance to a check-point, wherein calculating the risk said individual poses to said venue occurs

before the entry of said individual to said venue, and wherein said security clearance allows for expedited entry to said venue.

(emphasis added). The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not disclose the notion of having “security clearance[s] ... based on a calculation of the risk posed by said individual and a calculation of the risk posed by any groups associated with said individual” (claim 1).

In the Office Action, the Examiner correctly points out that Stanard “does not specifically mention that a security risk is calculated on the individual” (Office Action, pg. 8, last paragraph). To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Patent Application Publication 2004/0030640 (“Mahnken”).

However, Mahnken also falls short of disclosing this claim 1 limitation. Mahnken merely discloses a method to determine the *financial risk* a prospective resident poses (perhaps the *financial risk* an individual would pose to buying a ticket). Contrast this with “security clearance[s] ... based on a calculation of the risk posed by said individual and a calculation of the risk posed by any groups associated with said individual.” In short, determining *financial risk of an individual* is something wholly different from calculating *risk posed by individuals and any associated groups*. The Applicants point the Examiner to at least paragraph [0146] of the specification, which discusses this aspect of the presently recited subject matter.

Independent claims 42 and 51 also introduce a similar limitation to that of claim 1, and therefore patentably define over the cited art for similar reasons. Insofar as claims 31-35 and 39-41 depend from claim 31, and claims 43-44 and 47-49 depend from claim 42, they also define over the cited art.

Lastly, the Applicants respectfully note that they have not conceded that a security clearance is a product. (Office Action, pg. 5, first paragraph). Rather, Applicants have merely stated that “the product ordered by the customer *may be characterized as ... security clearance.*” (Office Action dated September 22, 2006, pg. 7, first paragraph) (emphasis added). As explained within the specification: “when a customer chooses to utilize the enhanced security clearance feature of the invention as exemplified by Fig. 22, the ‘product’ ordered by the customer may be

DOCKET NO.: IVOO-0034
Application No.: 09/976,836
Office Action Dated: May 18, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

characterized as check-in security clearance (preferably, expedited clearance as described above).” (Specification at [0148]).

DOCKET NO.: IVOO-0034
Application No.: 09/976,836
Office Action Dated: May 18, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Greg Plichta at 206-332-1380.

Date: September 18, 2007

/Grzegorz S. Plichta/
Grzegorz S. Plichta
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
999 Third Avenue Suite 3600
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: (206) 332-1380
Facsimile: (206) 624-7317